

SEC. . INCLUSION OF HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS.

Section 1105(d) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-240; 105 Stat 2033) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"The Secretary of Transportation shall include High Priority Corridor 18 as identified in section 1105(c) of this Act, as amended, on the approved National Highway System after completion of the feasibility study by the States as provided by such Act."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, this is a clarifying amendment. It establishes that high-priority corridor 18 is in fact included in the National Highway System. This had been a presumptive fact, but circumstances have arisen which make it prudent and in the interest of the State of Arkansas that this be so stated in statute.

I believe this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, the Members on this side are in agreement with this amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is an agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1426) was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CHAFEE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRANCE TO CONDUCT NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I was disturbed, almost alarmed, when I saw that the new President of France had said that France was going to conduct eight nuclear tests. It is not at all certain, from the press releases I have seen, what the magnitude of those tests will be—that is, how much plutonium will be used and what the kilotonnage will be.

Second, I would like to say that I think President Chirac is off to a very bad start. The precedent that he is setting is certainly going to influence people in this country who, for no sound reason, think we should also begin testing again. And sure enough, this morning, I read an account—I think maybe from Reuters—that our Secretary of Defense, William Perry, has said that he is getting ready to present the President with a series of options for resuming tests, from 4 pounds of plutonium to a full-scale test. He does not say how many tests will be conducted. But the argument is the same as that being used by France, that is, we have to determine the reli-

ability of our deployed weapons and our stockpiles.

Now, bear in mind, Mr. President, that we test our ballistic missiles every year. I have been arguing on the floor of the Senate for 3 years that we are buying more D-5 missiles than we can possibly use on our Trident submarines. And in my arguments, I have always insisted that the number I think we should procure is not only adequate for the purposes, but also allows the Defense Department to continue testing anywhere from three to five D-5 missiles every year to determine their reliability.

I understand that this falls in the category of things that the Defense Department would like to do but does not have to do.

We are coming up on a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which is supposed to go into effect in 1996, and we are all trying to get under the wire now with these little tests which were portrayed as to be "so small as to be insignificant," at least for the French, just prior to asking every other nation to be good scouts and obey what has been agreed to in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I hope the President of the United States will have the courage to do what he did the first year he was in office and say, "No more testing." He first said no testing for 15 months. When 15 months was over, he said no more testing, indefinitely. This is an indefinite ban on testing by the United States.

He no more had the words out of his mouth, and the Defense Department says it is absolutely essential to determine the reliability of our weapons, and we must start testing all over again.

Now, Mr. President, I will say, I know the makeup of this body. I know the makeup of the House. Unless the President says "No," and is prepared to stick with it, we will start testing.

That sends a message to every two-bit dictator in the world. We have been pleading with nations that we know are involved in trying to develop nuclear weapons, we have been pleading with them "Don't do it." Now what kind of a message does it send to those same nations when we start testing again? The United States and France will be the two most irresponsible nations on the planet Earth—if we join France and start testing again.

I do not intend to call the President. He has a lot of things to do. He knows my feelings about it. I have discussed it with him on previous occasions. I just think it would be a terrible thing for the United States, a terrible precedent, here 1 year away from the implementation of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, would he yield to me for a question?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Sir, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas

will recall that in 1974, the Republic of India detonated a nuclear device.

Mr. BUMPERS. I remember it well. Mr. MOYNIHAN. The second-most populated nation in the world, and in the 20 years since, they have never yet detonated a second—not because they are members of the Test Ban Treaty, but because they feel there is an international constraint in place and it would be in some way inappropriate. Not that they could not or that they would not like to. They have not done it.

Would the Senator consider whether or not our now presumed testing, and French testing in the Pacific, would not put pressure on regimes such as that of India, or regimes which are clearly capable of nuclear devices, such as Pakistan?

Is that what we want started?

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senator makes my point better than I made it myself.

I must say, the Senator has given me a piece of information, as closely as I try to follow this issue, that I did not realize, and that is that India has never tested since their first test.

With some respect, we expect this sort of thing from the Chinese. In the world diplomacy, the Chinese have never been quite as concerned as to how the nations of the world community might feel about what they do. They test when they are ready. As far as I know, China is the only nation that has tested since the President took that bold initiative in 1993.

It does not endear them to me, but they have always danced to their own tune, marched to their own drummer.

I thought it was irresponsible for them to start testing, but be that as it may, our thinking about testing sends a terrible signal to every nation on Earth. It seems we are doing our very best to torpedo both the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

I might also say, incidentally, on the other side of the coin, once India tested, Pakistan decided it needed nuclear weapons. The Senator is all too familiar with the problems we have with Pakistan and India, now. It is never ending. The Pakistanis will never be satisfied until they think they are co-equal in the nuclear game with India.

Every time somebody joins the field, some other nation that has a 1,000-year history of animosity with that nation immediately goes to work—Iran and Iraq, and so it goes.

UNITED STATES ROLE REGARDING BOSNIA

Mr. BUMPERS. Now, Mr. President, I want to make a point on a different subject that has been discussed here several times today dealing with Bosnia. I heard the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Senator NUNN, a moment ago. I must say I thought the Senator made some very cogent points about what the United States role should be.

Even though I have steadfastly opposed the introduction of ground forces in Bosnia, I think the British and the French are on fairly solid ground when they chastise the United States for trying to tell them how to conduct themselves there. And they remind us periodically, that we have not been facing the same kind of threat they have. They are the ones who have had their troops taken hostage. They are the people who have had people killed. We have not.

If it is determined that we are going to withdraw the UNPROFOR forces from Bosnia, then I think the United States has a role to play. I am not sure, and I am not prepared today to define it in any detail, but certainly in my opinion we have a financial role to play.

We have been neglecting our dues to the United Nations because there is a trend in this country that thinks that somehow or another the United Nations is subversive.

I watched some of that militia hearing the other day. I never heard as many cockamamie theories in my life in such a short period of time about what a terrible Government we have. I wanted to ask, why is everybody in the world scratching and clawing and swimming the ocean to try to get here, if it is such a terrible place?

Back to Bosnia. We have an obligation. We are part of NATO. We are part of the United Nations. We have not been nearly as diligent as we should be in our commitment to our dues to the United Nations, or paying for the peacekeeping operation.

I think the Senator from New York will be much more familiar with this than I am, but as far as I know, the part of our dues we are furthest behind on is in the peacekeeping area. Yet we have championed all of these peacekeeping operations.

I spent a day at the United Nations a couple of years ago, and at that time I was shocked to find the United Nations has something like—I hesitate to say—20, 25 peacekeeping operations going on in the world right now.

We only know about the Golan Heights, and Bosnia, and some of the more visible areas, but the United Nations has peacekeeping operations all over the world, trying to keep people from fighting. A very laudable undertaking.

Let me remind those people who always want to denigrate the United Nations and the whole concept of world cooperation that time and again on this floor I have applauded President George Bush for going to the United Nations and getting that body's approval of Desert Storm and for recruiting a lot of the countries in the United Nations to assist in that operation. It was essentially a U.S. effort, but we had tremendous help from other nations because we were operating as a group of nations that the United Nations had endorsed for this operation.

Now, I have about reached the conclusion. About the time I wrote an op-

ed piece in my own State newspaper, I read an article by Tom Friedman in the New York Times. Tom Friedman had been in Lebanon and wrote a magnificent book called "From Beirut to Jerusalem." A magnificent book.

He pointed it out in this New York Times piece last week, that in Bosnia, as in Lebanon, we have religion as one of the centrally dividing issues—they are not different ethnically.

It is my understanding during the Ottoman Empire the Turks said to the Bosnians, "You may be blond and blue-eyed but you will be Moslem."

I can tell the Senator from New York is not agreeing with me on that. He is the historian, so it must not have been the Ottoman Empire. It may have been later.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for a question? Sharing his great regard for Tom Friedman's comments in this respect, I think the Bosnians were of a religious group within the Catholic Church which was being excommunicated, and they chose to affiliate with Islam in that setting.

Mr. BUMPERS. I was not quoting Tom Friedman on that point.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. It was, in a certain sense, a voluntary conversion.

Mr. BUMPERS. Perhaps so. But his bottom line was when the Serbs and the Bosnian Moslems tire of fighting each other, they will reach some kind of an accord.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. And then the United Nations might be able to help.

Mr. BUMPERS. And while I want to support the foreign policy of the President and the Secretary of State, we may very well have reached the time—the President made a compelling point the other day in support of his position. Everybody says our policy in Bosnia now is an unmitigated disaster.

The President responds by saying, in 1993, I guess it was, 92,000 people were killed in Bosnia. In 1994, 3,000 were killed. So it is difficult to say the policy is an unmitigated disaster when that many lives are being saved.

But there is not any question, the six Bosnian Moslem enclaves, are threatened. They are going to starve. Something is going to happen. Some of them have not been resupplied in months, and something is going to have to give.

I am almost of the opinion that perhaps we should withdraw. While we might not be, as a nation, actively involved in arming Bosnian Moslems, other nations are perfectly willing to do that if we can figure out a way to get the weapons to them. That does not mean that war is going to reach a stalemate. It does not mean the Bosnian Moslems are going to be winners ultimately. But at least it would help equalize the sides. The thing is totally unfair now to them.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUMPERS. I will be happy to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Bosnia is a member of the United Nations. It has been invaded by another country and in sup-

port of an internal dispute. The Yugoslavian Army, out of Belgrade, is clearly involved. We now learn that it was computers in Belgrade that brought down Captain O'Grady's F-16. Under the United Nations Charter it is elemental that Bosnia has the right of self-defense. And for the United Nations to impose an arms embargo on a member state which has been invaded is to put the charter in jeopardy. Would the Senator not agree?

Mr. BUMPERS. Absolutely. The Senator makes a very, very compelling point that I should have started off with.

So, to allow a member nation to be systematically choked to death while other U.N. members, as well as NATO, essentially look on and allow it to happen is totally unacceptable. Either we get involved or we get out. I doubt very seriously the people of this country would stand very long for our entry into the war. I saw a poll last week that said 61 percent of the people in this country are now saying they would not oppose the introduction of American ground troops in Bosnia. I do not happen to be a member of that 61 percent, because I realize what a sticky wicket this can be. But I was shocked by that number.

Mr. President, I found the Senate in a quorum call and I thought I would just make these few comments regarding those two issues.

I thank the Senator for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Arkansas we are not closing up right now. If the Senator has nothing further to say, we will go into a quorum call unless the Senator from New York has something to say. The majority leader will be closing up the Senate a little later. He has a statement he wishes to make.

In connection with the bill before us, the highway bill, we have done as much of our work as we can do today, so I will be leaving. But the place will remain open until the majority leader comes in, sometime not too long, I guess.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the